HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (C) No. 2577 of 2007

PETITIONER : Smt. Urmila Agrawal, aged about 45 years, Wd/o. Late Shanker Lal Agrawal, Occupation Business, R/o Sattigudi Chauk, Raigarh Tahsil and District Raigarh (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1) State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Revenue Department, DKS Bhavan, Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.)
2) Nazul Officer, Raigarh (C.G.)
3) Nagar Palika Nigam, Raigarh (C.G.) Through Commissioner

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

SB: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

Present: Smt. Hamida Siddique, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri Suryakant Mishra, Panel Lawyer for the sTate/respondents 1 & 2
Shri B.D.Guru, Advocate for the respondent No. 3.

ORDER

(Passed on 7th day of August, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, at her request, was permitted to delete the prayer clause No. 7.1 vide order dated 18.7.2007. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been in possession of the disputed property on the basis of Patta granted to her father-in-law namely Shri Kashi Lal Agrawal in the year 1974. Even prior to that, they had been in peaceful possession of the disputed land since 1953.

2. Learned counsel further submits that the respondent No. 2 be directed to decide the right of the petitioner in the pending Revenue Case No. 10 A-4/2004-05, which has been pending for about last two years, expeditiously. In the meantime, the petitioner be permitted to continue in possession of the

(81)

said property, to which the learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection.

3. The respondent No. 2 is accordingly directed to adjudicate and decide the pending Revenue Case No. 10 A-4/2004-05 as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In the meantime, the possession of petitioner shall not be disturbed till the decision of the above revenue case.

4. With the above observation, this petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Amit